

LPTENS-99/41
 hep-th/9911008
 August 1999

BACKLUND TRANSFORMATIONS IN 10D SUSY YANG–MILLS THEORIES

(with a preamble on the birth of supersymmetry)

*Contribution to Y. Golfand Memorial Volume
 “Many faces of Superworld”, World Scientific.*

Jean-Loup GERVAIS,

Laboratoire de Physique Théorique de l’École Normale Supérieure ¹,
 24 rue Lhomond, 75231 Paris CÉDEX 05, France.

Abstract

A Bäcklund transformation is derived for the Yang’s type (super) equations previously derived (hep-th/9811108) by M. Saveliev and the author, from the ten dimensional super Yang-Mills field equations in an on-shell light cone gauge. It is shown to be based upon a particular gauge transformation satisfying nonlinear conditions which ensure that the equations retain the same form. These Yang’s type field equations are shown to be precisely such that they automatically provide a solution of these conditions. This Bäcklund transformation is similar to the one proposed by A. Lesnov for self-dual Yang-Mills in four dimensions. In the introduction a personal recollection on the birth of supersymmetry is given.

¹UMR 8549: Unité Mixte du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, et de l’École Normale Supérieure.

1 Remembering the early times.

A general history of the birth of supersymmetry may be found elsewhere in this volume (see “Revealing The Path To Superworld” by M.S. Marinov), and I will not try to give a complete overview. As is well known, supersymmetry started long before the Iron Curtain was dismantled, and thus came into existence separately in the West and the former Soviet Union. This volume is (rightly) dedicated to the pionnering contribution of Yuri Abramovich Golfand. With Evgeny Likhtman, he took many basic initial steps towards supersymmetry as we know now. An account of this story may be found in Shifman’s Introduction to this book, and in Likhtman’s “Notes of a Former Graduate Student” elsewhere in this volume. Regretfully, I never had the chance to meet Golfand in person. I hope very much that this volume will play an important role in the proper recognition of his memory.

In order to speak about what I know personally, I will recall that, in the West, superalgebras were first considered by A. Neveu, J. Schwarz and P. Ramond as a basic tool to eliminate ghosts from the spinning string theories, when they first introduced them —they were thus initially referred to as supergauges. These authors used the covariant harmonic oscillator approach, the only known technics at that time, without field theoretic interpretation. Preparing the present text brought back wonderful memories of the time when my long lasting collaboration and friendship with Bunji Sakita² began. In 1970-71 we started to develop the world-sheet interpretation of the spinning string —unknown at that early time— extending earlier discussions of the purely bosonic case begun by H. Hsue B. Sakita and M. Virasoro. We recognized that the Neveu-Schwarz Ramond models include world-sheet two-dimensional Dirac spinor fields in addition to the world sheet scalar fields common with the Virasoro model. We showed that the supergauges of the NS-R models correspond to the fact that the two dimensional world-sheet Lagrangian is invariant under transformations with anticommuting parameters which mix the scalar and spinor fields. In the West, this gave the first example of a supersymmetric local Lagrangian.

This supersymmetry was closing only on-shell for lack of auxiliary fields, and was two dimensional. In the West, the problems of proceeding off shell and to four dimensions were initially solved by Wess and Zumino, as is well known.

These are the historical facts simply stated. It is worth trying to give a more personal picture of the birth of supersymmetry. For me, the story really begins during the year 1968-69 which was a sort of turning point. I was just returning from two years of postdoc at New York University, where I had met B. Zumino (then the head of the Theory Group), K. Symanzik, W. Zimmermann (at that time permanent faculty members) and J. Wess (a visitor for one year). Before that my interest was mostly on dispersion relations, Regge poles, and S-matrix theory, but at NYU, I had been fully converted to local field theory, and much

²then a Visiting Professor both at the Institut des Hautes Etudes, in Bures-sur Yvette, and at the Laboratoire de Physique Théorique et Hautes Energies, University of Orsay, France.

impressed by the power of symmetries in that context, be they local or global. Of course, this year saw the beginning of string theory which was, however initially developed using the covariant operator method within the context of S-matrix theory, giving what looked like a realisation of G. Chew's program. On the other hand, local field theory also made wonderful progress on its own. The main problems of that time were the Adler-Bell-Jackiw anomaly, the spontaneous breaking of symmetries and the quantization of Yang-Mills theory. For the latter, the work of L. Faddeev and V. Popov was gradually becoming more and more popular. It is hardly necessary to say that these topics now belong to textbooks. At that time the French Government was very generous with temporary positions, and a handful of key visitors came for long visits ³ during that wonderful year: D. Amati, the late Benjamin Lee, T. Veltman, and B. Zumino. I drew much inspiration from the very stimulating atmosphere they created, together with the more senior permanent members. In particular, with Amati, and Bouchiat I devised the now standard method to compute loops in string theories, using coherent states, and with B. Lee, I showed how to correctly quantize the linear σ model in the phase where the spontaneous symmetry breaking takes place ⁴.

This is all to say that, when I first met Bunji Sakita in fall 1970, I was fully motivated to apply field theory technics to string theories. Moreover, the year before I had shown that the integrand of the Veneziano model is equal to the vacuum expectation of a product of scalar field which are functions of the Koba Nielsen variables. This result, similar to an independent and better known work by S. Fubini and G. Veneziano, was indeed a strong hint of the world-sheet field theory aspect of string theory. This viewpoint is now a common place, but at that time it was not at all popular among string theorists. A large majority preferred the operator method, which achieved striking technical success.

Before we met, Sakita and his collaborators had already made important progress in developing world-sheet field theory technics using path integrals. On the one hand, H. Hsue, B. Sakita, and M. Virasoro had shown how the analog model of H.B. Nielsen could be derived from the path integral over a free scalar 2D field. On the other hand, Sakita came with the draft of an article where he had started to discuss Feynman-like rules for the Veneziano model using the factorisation of path integrals over sliced Riemann surfaces. There were many basic problems left, and at the beginning, we spent a lot of time establishing a general scheme. This complicated work was not so well-received, although it contains many precursive results. For the following, the most important point was that we made an essential use of the conformal invariance of the path integral representation over scalar free fields in two dimensions. Although we did not really consider the gauge-fixing problem at that time, we were pretty much

³at the Laboratoire de Physique Théorique et Hautes Energies of Orsay (France) where I was working permanently then,

⁴ It seems that G. 't Hooft —then a student at Cargèse during the following summer— drew much inspiration for quantizing massive Yang-Mills theory, from B. Lee's lecture on spontaneous symmetry breaking.

convinced that conformal invariance of the free world-sheet action is at the origin of the negative normed state elimination. On spring when we came accross the first article of A. Neveu and J. Schwarz, this motivated us to systematically discuss conformal field theories in two dimensions, as a way to classify string theories, by defining what we called irreducible fields —now known as primary fields, following A. Belavin, A. Polyakov, and A.B. Zamolodchikov. Considering only quadratic actions we recognized that only spin-zero and spin-one-half fields were possible, covering all existing critical string models of today. This was all very well except for one fact: the Neveu-Schwarz model has more ghosts and needs an additional negative-normed-state killing mechanism as compared with the Veneziano model. This had motivated these authors, as well a Ramond in his seminal work, to introduce in the operator formalism a set of operators whose anticommutators gave the Virasoro generators. The visit of Sakita in France was about to terminate, and he became busy with moving with his family, but I quickly started to look for the possible symmetry of the action that would be the origin of this additional ghost killing. From the form of the NS-R generators it was immediately clear that the transformed of the boson had to be a fermion and vice versa. It was not difficult to envisage that the action could be invariant, except for the mixing between commuting and anticommuting fields which made everything very confusing. After many hesitations, Sakita and I solved the problem by introducing symmetry transformations with anticommuting parameters, from which the supersymmetry of the world-sheet NS-R action followed very simply. The paper was completed and thus for us supersymmetry was born (August 1971) just the day before Sakita departed France to fill his new prestigious position at City College New-York.

At that time, the use of anticommuting c-numbers was not well appreciated in our communities, and this work did not get much attention in general. In December 1971 Sakita delivered a talk about it at the Conference on Functional Methods in Field Theory and Statistics at the Lebedev Institute in Moscow, organised by E. Fradkin. On the way back, Sakita stopped over in Paris, and we wrote a summary of our ideas for the proceedings which was sent to the organisers and circulated as a preprint —the complete proceedings them-selves were never published⁵. Through this, there was some early communication of our work to the soviet scientific community.

Scientifically we separated at a very unfortunate moment of our research program. At that time of course there was no email. Phone was expensive and airmail slow. Moreover Sakita became busy with his new life and responsibilities. I did not push very hard further in the direction of Supersymmetry to my regret. Other problems seem more pressing. In the mean time the Nambu-Gotto action and the Goddard Goldstone Rebbi and Thorn light-cone quantization had come out. Sakita and I showed⁶ how the latter may be recovered using path in-

⁵We later published our text in Quantum Field Theory and Quantum Statistics, Essays in honour of the sixtieth birthday of E.S. Fradkin, vol 2, p. 435, Adam Hilger, 1987.

⁶This work was initiated during my one-month visit at City College during October 1972.

tegral with the former action using the Faddeev-Popov method in order to handle reparametrisation invariance. This work raised much interest and criticism ⁷. The main objection was that our gauge depends upon the external sources, and thus is not easily factorizable, in contrast with our previous path integral formulation. We tried hard to understand what was going on but failed. The answer was given by S. Mandelstam: the light-cone gauge is not conformally invariant, so that there is only one (preferred) parametrisation where factorization holds with our gauge fixing. With this parametrisation one sees strings (with lengths equal to their respective p_+) which split and join, and our work played a key role for Mandelstam's subsequent discussion of scattering amplitudes, which led to light-cone string field theory.

On the other hand, there remained the problem of obtaining our free world-sheet action of the NS-R models by gauge fixing from a local Lagrangian. This problem, first considered by Iwasaki and K. Kikkawa, played a key role in the subsequent development of supersymmetry ⁸. In spring 1973, Sakita visited the Niels Bohr Institute and I made a trip there to meet with him. On the way back home, he went to CERN and gave a talk where Zumino was present. Sakita reviewed the work of Iwasaki and Kikkawa. Later on it appeared that this seminar and a later conversation with Zumino played a key role in leading Wess and Zumino to begin their seminal work on supersymmetry. I also remember that the latter author asked me questions about our works on various occasions. After that the whole subject suddenly exploded, and our contribution was temporarily forgotten for lack of reference ⁹, given the fact that we had turned to other research directions.

Many other basic developments were initiated in those wonderful times. In particular, and since this article deals with the super Yang-Mills theories in ten dimensions which appear in the zero slope limit of type I string theory, it may be worth recalling that I was at the same time collaborating with A. Neveu on the zero-slope limit of string theories ¹⁰.

2 Introducing the present work.

Three decades later, it obvious that supersymmetry has played a key role in theoretical physics, although it is so badly broken at accessible energies that it

⁷in particular from the referee and at a seminar which Sakita gave at the Institute in Princeton on December 1972,

⁸ At that time there were both at City College and had much interaction with Sakita.

⁹Our original paper was nevertheless reprinted in the first volume of *SUPERSTRINGS The first 15 years of superstring theory* edited by J. Schwarz.

¹⁰ which had just been developed for the purely bosonic case by J. Scherk, following a remark by R. Omnes at a lunch at Orsay where I was also present, and quickly extended by A. Neveu and J. Scherk to spinning strings. Our work was dug out two decades later when Bern and Kossover showed that string inspired rearrangements of Feynman graphs give tremendous simplifications in high order perturbation of gauge theories.

is not yet verified experimentally. Generally speaking, supersymmetric theories seem to enjoy striking properties which led to remarkable developments. In particular non perturbative results have been derived in theories with extended supersymmetries which show a striking connection between exact integration and supersymmetry. The present work initiated in collaboration with the late Misha Saveliev[1] goes along this line, being connected with the exact integration of classical super Yang-Mills in ten dimensions. Here as in many recent theoretical advances, supersymmetry plays a key role. Thus it is proper to present this work as a tribute to the Yuri Golfand Memorial Volume.

Shifman's introduction to the present volume bears a striking testimony of the hardships which Yuri Golfand underwent in the terrible pressure of the communist system. This is fortunately gone by now. It is a very nice that it is possible to collaborate freely with the Russian scientists who chose to remain in their native country, although the practical life there has become so difficult that some of them have died prematurely.

At this point another historical note may be in order. My work with Sakita on functional approach to string theories did not deal with quantum anomalies. The basic reason is that there is no way to regularize the Nambu-Gotto action while preserving reparametrization invariance. This problem was nicely cured a decade later by S. Polyakov using the action of L. Brink P. Di Vecchia and P. Howe. This led me, with A. Neveu and others to extensive studies of the exact quantum solution of the Liouville theory. This theory is completely integrable classically and is a particular case of the Toda theories which were nicely solved by A. Lesnov and M. Saveliev. With A. Bilal, I showed that they obey ¹¹ W symmetries in general. This raised my interest in Toda theories and in integrable theories in general. This is how I was led me to collaborate with M. Saveliev until his unfortunate death. It is now apparent that theories with enough local supersymmetries are the higher dimensional analogues of two dimensional conformal/integrable theories. In particular it has been known[4, 5] already for some time that ten dimensional supersymmetric Yang-Mills are similar to self-dual Yang-Mills theories in four dimensions in the sense that the field equations are equivalent to flatness conditions. More recently, the interest was revived into (suitably reduced) ten dimensional supersymmetric Yang-Mills theories in the large N limit since they have been actively considered in the search for the M theory (see e.g refs[6, 7]). This has motivated us to return to the use of flatness conditions in superspace in order to derive non trivial classical solutions. Our initial idea was to try to apply method inspired by the ones of Lesnov and Saveliev to them. However, different approaches, more closely inspired from self-dual Yang-Mills in four dimensions have turned out to be more fruitful [1] [2] [3].

Let us first recall some standard formulae in order to establish the notations.

¹¹speaking only about the conformal ones,

In ten dimensions the dynamics is specified by the standard action

$$S = \int d^{10}x \operatorname{Tr} \left\{ \frac{-1}{4} Y_{mn} Y^{mn} + \frac{1}{2} \bar{\phi} (\Gamma^m \partial_m \phi + [X_m, \phi]_-) \right\}, \quad (2.1)$$

$$Y_{mn} = \partial_m X_n - \partial_n X_m + [X_m, X_n]_- . \quad (2.2)$$

The notation is as follows. $X_m(\underline{x})$ is the vector potential, $\phi(\underline{x})$ is the Majorana-Weyl spinor. Both are matrices in the adjoint representation of the gauge group $\mathbf{G}$. Latin indices $m = 0, \dots, 9$ describe Minkowski components. Greek indices $\alpha = 1, \dots, 16$ denote spinor components. We will use the superspace formulation with odd coordinates θ^α . The super vector potentials, which are valued in the gauge group, are noted $A_m(\underline{x}, \underline{\theta})$, $A_\alpha(\underline{x}, \underline{\theta})$. It has been shown [5] that we may remove all the additional fields and uniquely reconstruct the physical fields X_m , ϕ from A_m and A_α if we impose the condition $\theta^\alpha A_\alpha = 0$ on the latter.

With this condition the field equations derived from the Lagrangian 2.1 are equivalent [4] [5] to the flatness conditions

$$F_{\alpha\beta} = 0, \quad (2.3)$$

where F is the supercurvature

$$F_{\alpha\beta} = D_\alpha A_\beta - D_\beta A_\alpha + [A_\alpha, A_\beta]_+ + 2(\sigma^m)_{\alpha\beta} A_m. \quad (2.4)$$

D_α denote the superderivatives

$$D_\alpha = \partial_\alpha - (\sigma^m)_{\alpha\beta} \theta^\beta \partial_m, \quad (2.5)$$

and we use the Dirac matrices

$$\Gamma^m = \begin{pmatrix} 0_{16 \times 16} & ((\sigma^m)^{\alpha\beta}) \\ ((\sigma^m)_{\alpha\beta}) & 0_{16 \times 16} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Gamma^{11} = \begin{pmatrix} 1_{16 \times 16} & 0 \\ 0 & -1_{16 \times 16} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.6)$$

The physical fields appearing in equation 2.1 are reconstructed from the superfields A_m A_α as follows. Using the Bianchi identity on the super curvature one shows that one may write

$$F_{\alpha m} = (\sigma_m)_{\alpha\beta} \chi^\beta.$$

Then X_m , ϕ^α are, respectively, the zeroth order contributions in the expansions of A_m and χ^α in powers of the odd coordinates θ .

Throughout the paper, it will be convenient to use the following particular realisation:

$$((\sigma^9)^{\alpha\beta}) = ((\sigma^9)_{\alpha\beta}) = \begin{pmatrix} -1_{8 \times 8} & 0_{8 \times 8} \\ 0_{8 \times 8} & 1_{8 \times 8} \end{pmatrix} \quad (2.7)$$

$$((\sigma^0)^{\alpha\beta}) = -((\sigma^0)_{\alpha\beta}) = \begin{pmatrix} 1_{8 \times 8} & 0_{8 \times 8} \\ 0_{8 \times 8} & 1_{8 \times 8} \end{pmatrix} \quad (2.8)$$

$$\left((\sigma^i)^{\alpha\beta}\right) = \left((\sigma^i)_{\alpha\beta}\right) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \gamma_{\mu,\bar{\nu}}^i \\ (\gamma^{iT})_{\nu,\bar{\mu}} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad i = 1, \dots, 8. \quad (2.9)$$

The convention for greek letters is as follows: Letters from the beginning of the alphabet run from 1 to 16. Letters from the middle of alphabet run from 1 to 8. In this way, we shall separate the two spinor representations of $O(8)$ by rewriting $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{16}$ as $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_8, \bar{\nu}_1, \dots, \bar{\nu}_8$.

Using the above explicit realisations one sees that the equations to solve take the form

$$D_\mu A_\nu + D_\nu A_\mu + [A_\mu, A_\nu]_+ = 2\delta_{\mu\nu} (A_0 + A_9), \quad (2.10)$$

$$D_{\bar{\mu}} A_{\bar{\nu}} + D_{\bar{\nu}} A_{\bar{\mu}} + [A_{\bar{\mu}}, A_{\bar{\nu}}]_+ = 2\delta_{\bar{\mu}\bar{\nu}} (A_0 - A_9), \quad (2.11)$$

$$D_\mu A_{\bar{\nu}} + D_{\bar{\nu}} A_\mu + [A_\mu, A_{\bar{\nu}}]_+ = -2 \sum_{i=1}^8 A_i \gamma_{\mu,\bar{\nu}}^i. \quad (2.12)$$

At this point one makes use of the fact that equations 2.10 and 2.11 are, respectively the integrability conditions of the equations

$$(D_\mu - A_\mu) R_+ = 0, \quad (\partial_+ - A_+) R_+ = 0, \quad (2.13)$$

$$(D_{\bar{\mu}} - A_{\bar{\mu}}) R_- = 0, \quad (\partial_- - A_-) R_- = 0, \quad (2.14)$$

where $R_\pm$ are superfields valued in the gauge group. We let from now on

$$A_\pm = A_0 \pm A_9, \quad \partial_\pm = \frac{\partial}{\partial x^0} \pm \frac{\partial}{\partial x^9}. \quad (2.15)$$

A straightforward computation shows that equations 2.12 become

$$D_{\bar{\nu}} (\mathbf{R}^{-1} D_\mu \mathbf{R}) = -2 \sum_{i=1}^8 \tilde{A}_i \gamma_{\mu,\bar{\nu}}^i$$

$$\mathbf{R} \equiv R_+ R_-^{-1}, \quad \tilde{A}_i \equiv R_- (A_i + \partial_i) R_-^{-1}.$$

In practice, given $\mathbf{R}$, we may derive the field $\tilde{A}_i$, if the following conditions hold

$$\sum_{\mu\bar{\nu}} D_{\bar{\nu}} (\mathbf{R}^{-1} D_\mu \mathbf{R}) \gamma_{\mu\bar{\nu}}^{ijk} = 0, \quad 1 \leq i < j < k \leq 8. \quad (2.16)$$

These are complicated non linear σ model type equations in superspace which so far could not be handled. This is basically why these reasonings did not allow yet to construct any explicit nontrivial physically meaningful solution. Conditions 2.16 only provide a procedure [5] for obtaining infinite series of nonlocal, and rather complicated conservation laws.

3 Yang's form of the field equations

In this section, we repeat a previous discussion[1] for completeness.

3.1 A usefull on-shell gauge

Under gauge transformations, we have

$$R_{\pm} \rightarrow R_{\pm} \Lambda, \quad A_m \rightarrow \Lambda^{-1} (A_m + \partial_m) \Lambda, \quad A_{\alpha} \rightarrow \Lambda^{-1} (A_{\alpha} + D_{\alpha}) \Lambda.$$

Thus $\mathbf{R}$ is gauge invariant. If $\Lambda = R_-^{-1}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} A_+ &\rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{-1} \partial_+ \mathbf{R}, \quad A_{\mu} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{-1} D_{\mu} \mathbf{R}, \quad A_i \rightarrow \tilde{A}_i, \\ A_- &\rightarrow 0, \quad A_{\overline{\mu}} \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

Thus, if the field equations are satisfied there exists a gauge (on shell) such that $A_- = A_{\overline{\mu}} = 0$. After this gauge choice, the flatness conditions 2.10–2.12 boil down, respectively, to

$$D_{\mu} A_{\nu} + D_{\nu} A_{\mu} + [A_{\mu}, A_{\nu}]_+ = 4\delta_{\mu\nu} A_0, \quad (3.2)$$

$$0 = 0, \quad (3.3)$$

$$D_{\overline{\nu}} A_{\mu} = -2 \sum_1^8 \tilde{A}_i \gamma_{\mu, \overline{\nu}}^i. \quad (3.4)$$

The last mixed ones which in general lead to the complicated conditions 2.16 have become linear, and their general solution may be derived in closed form[1].

3.2 Dynamical equations for the superpotential field Φ .

It follows from the Dirac algebra that the γ matrices satisfy the equations

$$\gamma^i \gamma^{jT} + \gamma^j \gamma^{iT} = 2\delta_{ij}, \quad i, j = 1, \dots, 8. \quad (3.5)$$

We may choose $\gamma^8 = 1$. Then it follows that the other matrices, i.e. γ^i , $i = 1, \dots, 7$ are antisymmetric. With this choice of realisation, it is convenient to separate the symmetric and antisymmetric combinations of equations 3.4. This gives

$$D_{\overline{\nu}} A_{\mu} + D_{\overline{\mu}} A_{\nu} = -4\tilde{A}_8 \delta_{\mu, \overline{\nu}} \quad (3.6)$$

$$D_{\overline{\nu}} A_{\mu} - D_{\overline{\mu}} A_{\nu} = -4 \sum_1^7 \tilde{A}_i \gamma_{\mu, \overline{\nu}}^i \quad (3.7)$$

By convention greek letters with and without overline take the same numerical values, so that, for instance, $\gamma_{\mu \overline{\mu}}^8 = 1$. Next, with the present particular realisation, one may verify that $[D_{\overline{\mu}}, D_{\overline{\nu}}]_+ = 2\delta_{\overline{\mu}, \overline{\nu}} \partial_+$. Thus it follows from equations 3.6 that there exists a superfield Φ , such that

$$A_{\mu} = D_{\overline{\mu}} \Phi. \quad (3.8)$$

Then one finds that

$$\tilde{A}_8 = -2\partial_+\Phi. \quad (3.9)$$

Finally, one may eliminate $A_{\overline{\mu}}$ from all the remaining dynamical equations using equation 3.8. This gives

$$[D_{\overline{\nu}}, D_{\overline{\mu}}]_- \Phi = -4 \sum_1^7 \tilde{A}_i \gamma_{\mu, \overline{\nu}}^i \quad (3.10)$$

$$D_\mu D_{\overline{\nu}} \Phi + D_\nu D_{\overline{\mu}} \Phi + [D_{\overline{\mu}} \Phi, D_{\overline{\nu}} \Phi]_+ = 4\delta_{\mu\nu} A_0. \quad (3.11)$$

The general solution of equations 3.10 has been given in closed form[1]. Equations 3.11 are similar to Yang's equations. A partial class of solutions of these equations may be derived[1] using methods similar to the ones developed[10] for self-dual Yang-Mills theories in four dimensions. So far, however, it has not been possible to derive a solution of equation 3.11 which also satisfies equations 3.10. Thus we have still failed to solve the full Yang-Mills equations. In the search for more general solutions of 3.11, it is clear that the existence of Bäcklund transformations for the solutions of these equations may be very useful. In the present discussion we concentrate upon this topic, leaving aside the much harder problem of deriving simultaneous solutions of equations 3.11 and 3.10. We will have more to say at the end.

Before beginning the discussion, it is useful to present a generalisation of an argument given earlier[1] in the particular case where there is no dependence upon $x_1, \dots, x_8$, since it turns out to be crucial for the existence of the Bäcklund transformations we have in mind. The point is to show that equations 3.11 are equivalent to a set of differential conditions which are first order in the superderivatives. Using the fact that

$$[D_\mu, D_{\overline{\nu}}]_+ = -2\gamma_{\mu, \overline{\nu}}^i \partial_i$$

we rewrite equation 3.11 as

$$D_{\overline{\nu}} D_\mu \Phi + D_{\overline{\mu}} D_\nu \Phi + g [D_{\overline{\mu}} \Phi, D_{\overline{\nu}} \Phi]_+ = -4\delta_{\mu\nu} (A_0 + \partial_8 \Phi) \quad (3.12)$$

Next let us consider the superfield $\Omega_{\overline{\mu}}$ defined by

$$\Omega_{\overline{\mu}} = D_\mu \Phi - \frac{1}{2} [\Phi, D_{\overline{\mu}} \Phi]_-$$

Using equations 3.12 one finds that

$$D_{\overline{\nu}} \Omega_{\overline{\mu}} + D_{\overline{\mu}} \Omega_{\overline{\nu}} = -2\delta_{\mu\nu} \left(2A_0 + 2\partial_8 \Phi + \frac{1}{2} [\Phi, \partial_- \Phi]_- \right)$$

It thus follows that we may let $\Omega_{\overline{\mu}} = D_{\overline{\mu}} \Omega$. Finally equations 3.12 are equivalent to the conditions

$$D_\mu \Phi = D_{\overline{\mu}} \Omega + \frac{1}{2} [\Phi, D_{\overline{\mu}} \Phi]_- \quad (3.13)$$

with

$$A_0 = -\partial_8 \Phi - \frac{1}{2} \partial_- \Omega - \frac{1}{2} [\Phi, \partial_- \Phi]_- \quad (3.14)$$

At this point it is interesting to recall the four dimensional Yang equations which arose in solving self-dual (purely bosonic) Yang-Mills in four dimensions. For this, we closely follow an earlier review [10]. There are two bosonic complex coordinates z, y and their conjugate $\bar{z}, \bar{y}$. One may start from the equations (Indices mean derivatives)

$$(G_z G^{-1})_{\bar{z}} + (G_y G^{-1})_{\bar{y}} = 0,$$

where G is in the adjoint representation of the gauge group. This is partially solved by letting

$$G_z G^{-1} = f_{\bar{y}}, \quad G_y G^{-1} = -f_{\bar{z}}. \quad (3.15)$$

which leads to the consistency condition

$$f_{\bar{z}z} + f_{\bar{y}y} + [f_{\bar{y}}, f_{\bar{z}}]_- = 0. \quad (3.16)$$

In order to draw a parallel with our case, let us recall that, according to equations 3.1, 3.8, we have

$$A_\mu = \mathbf{R}^{-1} D_\mu \mathbf{R} = D_{\bar{\mu}} \Phi. \quad (3.17)$$

There is a similarity between equations 3.11 and 3.16, and between equations 3.15, and 3.17, except that the indices are paired differently. On the other hand, the equations considered bear some similarities with the ones considered for self-dual Yang-Mills theories with extended supersymmetries [9].

4 Bäcklund transformations

4.1 The principle

The discussion we are going to present is closely inspired by the corresponding ideas developed [8] [9] for self-dual Yang-Mills theories. Nevertheless we are able to somewhat clarify the mechanism which is at work. At this point let us recall that we want to establish transformations between solutions of equations 3.11. These coincide with the symmetric part of equations 2.12 in the gauge where $A_{\bar{\mu}} = 0$ where the first and third terms on the left are absent. The new insight is that a Bäcklund transformation of the type developed so far [8] for self-dual Yang-Mills theories, correspond to a particular gauge transformation, say $A \rightarrow A'$ (from the on-shell light cone gauge we are using, where $A_\mu = D_{\bar{\mu}} \Phi$) which is such that the symmetric part of equations 2.12 retain the same form; so that we may define a superfield Υ by letting $A'_\mu = D_{\bar{\mu}} \Upsilon$ thereby obtaining a new solution of equations 3.11.

4.2 Definition

Let us thus consider a gauge transformation $A \rightarrow A'$ where

$$A'_\alpha = S A_\alpha S^{-1} - (D_\alpha S) S^{-1}$$

Clearly

$$A'_\mu = S (D_\mu \Phi) S^{-1} - (D_\mu S) S^{-1}, \quad A'_\mu = - (D_\mu S) S^{-1},$$

satisfy equations 2.12. Thus we get, after symmetrizing in μ and ν

$$D_\mu A'_\nu + D_\nu A'_\mu + \left\{ D_{\bar{\nu}} A'_\mu + D_{\bar{\mu}} A'_\nu + [A'_\mu, A'_{\bar{\nu}}]_+ + [A'_\nu, A'_{\bar{\mu}}]_+ \right\} = -4A'_8 \delta_{\mu, \bar{\nu}}. \quad (4.1)$$

This will have the same form as the corresponding equation for $A_{\bar{\mu}}$, i.e. the symmetric part of equation 3.4, if the terms in bracket is also proportional to $\delta_{\mu\nu}$. After some calculation one sees that this condition is equivalent to the conditions

$$D_\mu (S^{-1} D_{\bar{\nu}} S) + [D_{\bar{\mu}} \Phi, (S^{-1} D_{\bar{\nu}} S)]_+ + \{\mu \leftrightarrow \nu\} \propto \delta_{\mu, \bar{\nu}} \quad (4.2)$$

If these conditions can be solved, A'_μ is such that $D_{\bar{\mu}} A'_\nu + D_{\bar{\nu}} A'_\mu \propto \delta_{\mu, \nu}$. Thus we may define a superfield Υ by letting $A'_\mu = D_{\bar{\mu}} \Upsilon$. Thus we finally relate Φ and Υ by the relations

$$S (D_{\bar{\mu}} \Phi) S^{-1} + S D_\mu S^{-1} = \partial_{\bar{\mu}} \Upsilon. \quad (4.3)$$

Since A'_μ satisfies the gauge transformed of equation 2.10, Υ satisfies the equations

$$D_\mu D_{\bar{\nu}} \Upsilon + D_\nu D_{\bar{\mu}} \Upsilon + [D_{\bar{\mu}} \Upsilon, D_{\bar{\nu}} \Upsilon]_+ = 2\delta_{\mu\nu} (A'_0 + A'_9).$$

We have thus obtained a Bäcklund transformation for equation 3.11, since the latter equations have the same form.

4.3 Solving the condition for S

The essential point is that the first order equations 3.16 which are equivalent to equations 3.11 are precisely such that the conditions 4.2 may be explicitly solved. We shall show this for the particular case of the gauge group A_1 . Let us then write

$$\Phi = \Phi_+ X^+ + \Phi_- X^- + \Phi_0 H$$

with $[H, X^\pm]_- = 2X^\pm$, $[X^+, X^-] = H$. Consider the automorphism of the algebra generated by r which is such that

$$r X^\pm r^{-1} = X^\mp, \quad r H r^{-1} = -H.$$

First, we change the gauge transformation from S to Sr so that the condition to be satisfied becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[S^{-1} (D_{\overline{\nu}} S), (D_{\overline{\mu}} \tilde{\Phi}) \right]_+ + \left[S^{-1} (D_{\overline{\mu}} S), (D_{\overline{\nu}} \tilde{\Phi}) \right]_+ \\ & + D_{\mu} (S^{-1} D_{\overline{\nu}} S) + D_{\nu} (S^{-1} D_{\overline{\mu}} S) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\Phi} = r\Phi r^{-1}$. A straightforward computation shows that these equations are satisfied by letting

$$S = e^{\tilde{\Omega} X^+} (\Phi_+)^H, \quad (4.4)$$

if the superfield $\tilde{\Omega}$ satisfies the equations

$$D_{\overline{\mu}} \tilde{\Omega} = 2\Phi^+ D_{\overline{\mu}} \Phi^0 + D_{\mu} \Phi^+.$$

The crucial point is that this latter conditions are almost the same as equations 3.13. Indeed, it is easy to see that they are satisfied if we let

$$\tilde{\Omega} = \Omega_+ + \Phi_0 \Phi_+ \quad (4.5)$$

where we have used the decomposition $\Omega = \Omega_+ X^+ + \Omega_0 H + \Omega_- X^-$

5 Outlook

In summary, we have been able to devise a Bäcklund transformation for equations derived from 2.10 and the symmetric part of equation 2.12, in a gauge where equation 2.11 becomes trivial. This is yet nother indication that the system of equations 2.10, 2.11, and the symmetric part of 2.12 is completely integrable and has similarities with self-dual Yang-Mills in four dimensions. Another similar property is the existence of a Lax representation [2] [3] analogous to the one of Belavin and Sakharov. As a matter of fact, it is easy to see that we have solved a variant of the field equations, 2.10–2.12 where the last is replaced by

$$D_{\mu} A_{\overline{\nu}} + D_{\overline{\nu}} A_{\mu} + [A_{\mu}, A_{\overline{\nu}}]_+ = -2 \sum_{i=1}^8 A_i \gamma_{\mu, \overline{\nu}}^i + \sum_{i,j=1}^7 B_{ij} \gamma_{\mu, \overline{\nu}}^{ij8}.$$

There appears an additional bosonic superfield B_{ij} . The physical meaning of this modified dynamics is under investigation [11].

The last point is that one may be worried that the Bäcklund transformation, being based on a gauge transformation maybe trivial. This is not so because we are able to relate solutions which are both in the same on-shell light cone gauge although our gauge transformation does not respect this gauge condition. This is possible since, after transformation, the term in bracket in equation 4.1 may be lumped into the right hand side. Thus in effect, the solutions are not related by gauge transformations.

Acknowledgements. I am indebted to D. Fairlie for discussions and for pointing earlier references [8] [9].

References

- [1] J.-L. Gervais, M. V. Saveliev: *Progress in classically solving ten dimensional supersymmetric reduced Yang-Mills theories*, hep-th/9811108, Nucl. Phys. **B554** (1999) 183.
- [2] J.-L. Gervais, *Lax equations in ten dimensional supersymmetric classical Yang-Mills theories*, hep-th/9903218, Contribution to the International Seminar on Integrable Systems, In Memoriam Mikhail V. Saveliev, Max Planck Institute for Mathematics Bonn.
- [3] J.-L. Gervais, *Solution generating in ten dimensional supersymmetric classical Yang-Mills theories*, hep-th/9910235, Contribution to the Dubna Memorial Volume In honour of Mikhail V. Saveliev.
- [4] E. Witten: *Twistor-like transform in ten dimensions*, Nuclear Physics **B266** (1986), 245–264.
- [5] E. Abdalla, M. Forger and M. Jacques: *Higher conservation laws for ten-dimensional supersymmetric Yang-Mills theories*, Nuclear Physics **B307** (1988), 198–220.
- [6] T. Banks, W. Fischler, S.H. Shenker, L. Susskind: *M theory as a Matrix model: a conjecture*, hep-th/9610043, Phys. Rev. **D55** (1997) 5112.
- [7] R. Dijkgraaf, E. Verlinde, H. Verlinde, *Matrix string theory*, hep-th/9703030, Nucl. Phys. **B500** (1997) 43.
- [8] A.N. Lesnov: *Bäcklund transformation of self-dual Yang-Mills fields for arbitrary semi simple gauge algebra*, Protvino preprint IHEP 91-145.
- [9] Ch. Devchand, A.N. Leznov: *Bäcklund transformations for supersymmetric self-dual theories for semisimple gauge groups and a hierarchy of A_1 solutions*, hep-th 9301098, Com. Math. Phys. **160** (1994) 551.
- [10] A. N. Leznov and M. V. Saveliev: *Exactly and Completely Integrable Non-linear Dynamical Systems*, Acta Applicandae Math. **16** (1989) 1–74.
- [11] J.-L. Gervais, H. Samtleben: *Integrable structures in off-shell 10D super Yang-Mills theory*, hep-th in preparation.